

## REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed June 3, 2009, has been received and its contents carefully studied. Claims 1, 6, 8-12, 17, 18, 20-23, 27, 30, 32 and 34 were pending and indicated as rejected. The Drawings filed May 4, 2005 have again been acknowledged as being accepted by the Examiner.

By this response, claims 1 and 32 have been amended in view of the Examiner's response to arguments section in the Final Office Action. See pg. 2. Specifically, Masao's processing units are not sealed to the passage of air therethrough. The Examiner has encouraged Applicant to positively recite the distinguishing feature of a "casing isolation". No statutory new matter has been added. All amendments are supported by the original specification.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)*

I. Claims 1, 8-12 and 30 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Masao (JP 2002-064044) in view of Hirose (US 5,762,745) and in view of Kuwabara (JP 04-217353). The rejection as to claims 1, 8-12 and 30 is traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "*the casing of the temperature control unit is isolated and sealed from the passage of air therethrough and is set in the housing at a level below the casing of the heating unit which also is isolated and sealed from the passage of air therethrough, and the casing of the coating unit is set in the housing at a level below the casing of the temperature control unit*".

Support for these amendments are exemplarily provided in FIG. 13 whereby air flows around each of the isolated casings 55b-e so as to achieve heat insulation between the casings. Applicant's arrangement also suppresses non-uniformity in the quality of coating films in the SCT 18 caused by SCT temperature changes due to dissipation of heat from other process units.

It is respectfully submitted that Masao's clean air is conducted by carrying path 10, which is centrally located in the processing device, into and through each of units HP1-4 and CP1-2. As for the ACU (i.e., two on respective sides of carrying path 10), air flows into each ACU unit via a blower 32 and enters each SCU through yet another particle filter 33. Because

air flows through all of Masao's tower units HP1-4, CP1-2, the ACU's, the SDI and SCI, there cannot be isolation of the heating and temperature units with respect to air flow. Therefore, Masao does not teach or disclose Applicant's claimed features requiring isolated and sealed casings for each of the temperature control unit and the heating unit.

Hirose and Kuwabara fail to remedy Masao's above-described deficiencies. Accordingly, the combination of Masao, Hirose and Kuwabara would not have rendered claim 1 *prima facie* obvious. Therefore, amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable thereover. As such, Applicant courteously requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection as to claim 1, and claims 8-12 and 30, dependent thereon.

**II.** Claims 6, 17-18 and 20 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Masao in view of Hirose in view of Kuwabara, and further in view of Hayashi (US 6,350,316). The rejection as to claims 6, 17-18 and 20 is respectfully traversed.

Applicant submits that Hayashi likewise fails to remedy the deficiencies of Masao, Hirose and Kuwabara, as described in connection with claim 1 above. Hence, for the reasons submitted for claim 1, *supra*, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection as to claims 6, 17-18 and 20.

**III.** Claims 21-23, 32 and 34 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Masao in view of Hirose, Kuwabara and Hayashi, and further in view of Nakai (US 6,071,047) The rejection is respectfully traversed for claims 21-23 and 32-34.

**A.** Regarding claims 21-23, Applicant submits that Nakai also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Masao, Hirose, Kuwabara and Hayashi with regard to claims 1 and 20 above. For the reasons submitted in claim 20, and claim 1, *supra*, Applicant thus also respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection as to claims 21-23.

**B.** Claim 32 has been amended to recite, "the casing of the temperature control unit is isolated and sealed from the passage of air there through and is set in the housing at a level below the casing of the heating unit which also is isolated and sealed from the passage of air there through, and the casing of the coating unit is set in the housing at a level below the casing of the temperature control unit".

It is respectfully urged that the above-mentioned claim features are not taught or disclosed in Masao, *supra*. See arguments for claim 1. Similarly Hirose and Kuwabara fails to remedy Masao's deficiency. Hayashi and Nakai also fail to remedy the deficiencies of Masao, Hirose and Kuwabara with respect to the claimed features of isolated and sealed casings for each of the temperature control unit and heating unit so as to prevent the passage of air there through. Therefore, the obvious rejection with respect to amended claim 32 must fail. Accordingly, Applicant courteously solicits reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection as to claim 32 and claim 34, dependent thereon.

**IV.** Claims 27 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Masao, Hirose, and Kuwabara, and in further view of Mahara (US 6,309,116). The rejection is traversed as to claim 27.

As to claim 27, Applicant submits that Mahara fails to remedy the deficiencies of Masao, Hirose and Kuwabara as to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant advances similar arguments on the merits as made for claim 1, *supra*, herein. In view of the foregoing, Applicant likewise solicits reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27.

### CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

If any fees under 37 C. F. R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 are due in connection with this filing, please charge the fees to Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Order No. 033082M252.

Respectfully submitted,  
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: 

---

Michael A. Makuch, Reg. No. 32,263  
1130 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 1130  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 263-4300  
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Dated: August 28, 2009

SGRDC\349616.1